



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: SEPTEMBER 8, 2014

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AR-2012-ADM-0190

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED], SES, [REDACTED], REGION [REDACTED] (ET AL),

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	EPA Region [REDACTED]	

**ALLEGATIONS:** On or about April 24, 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), hotline received an anonymous complaint, via email, alleging that [REDACTED] EPA, had a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee and that because of this sexual relationship, the EPA employee received a large cash award and was promoted over other more qualified candidates. Additionally, a separate allegation that two other EPA officials also had inappropriate relationships with their subordinates was reviewed and found to be without merit. During the course of the investigation, three additional issues were addressed. The OIG investigated the following:

- [REDACTED] and the EPA employee had a close personal relationship that presents the potential appearance of impartiality in [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee.
- [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] EPA computer and EPA email account for matters related to a non-profit organization, the [REDACTED], including communicating with the EPA employee about the [REDACTED].
- [REDACTED] had a sexual relationship with the EPA employee and, because of the sexual relationship, [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee cash awards and promotions.

**FINDINGS:**

- [REDACTED] and the EPA employee had a close personal relationship that presents the potential appearance of impartiality in [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee.

The OIG determined the allegation was supported. The investigation disclosed that [REDACTED] had a close personal relationship with a subordinate EPA employee.

- [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] EPA computer and EPA email account for matters related to a non-profit organization, the [REDACTED], including communicating with the EPA employee about the [REDACTED].

The OIG determined the allegation was supported. A review of [REDACTED] EPA emails identified approximately thirty (30) email with keywords relating to the [REDACTED] as well as an email from [REDACTED] to the EPA employee which asked him/her to review a [REDACTED] document.

- [REDACTED] had a sexual relationship with the EPA employee and, because of the sexual relationship, [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee cash awards and promotions.

The OIG determined the allegation was unsupported. The OIG investigation did not reveal evidence to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] engaged in a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee.

**DISPOSITION:** On September 4, 2014 Special Agent-in-Charge (SAC) [REDACTED] Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received an email with an attached memorandum from [REDACTED], Region [REDACTED] EPA. The memorandum documented that Region [REDACTED] has taken action against [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) Region [REDACTED] EPA for the allegations that were supported. As such, this case is being closed with no further action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF  
INSPECTOR GENERAL

APR 11 2014

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** [REDACTED] Region [REDACTED] EPA  
**FROM:** Arthur Elkins, Inspector General *Arthur C. Elkins*  
**TO:** [REDACTED] Regional Administrator, Region [REDACTED]  
**REFERENCE:** OIG Case No. OI-AR-2012-ADM-0190

**RESTRICTED INFORMATION**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Inspector General (OIG) initiated this investigation based on information received regarding allegations of employee misconduct by [REDACTED] Region [REDACTED]

The enclosed report of investigation details three allegations of misconduct that were investigated by the OIG. Two of the allegations were found to be supported and the third was unsupported. The supported allegations involved (1) [REDACTED] having a close personal relationship with a subordinate EPA employee, which presents the potential of an appearance of impartiality in [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee and (2) [REDACTED] use of [REDACTED] EPA computer and EPA email account for matters related to a non-profit organization, including [REDACTED] communicating with the EPA employee regarding the non-profit organization. The third allegation, which the OIG found to be unsupported, alleged [REDACTED] was having a sexual relationship with the subordinate EPA employee and, because of the sexual relationship, [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee awards and promotions.

These actions may have violated provisions of the following titles of the Code of Federal Regulations and/or EPA Orders:

Title 5 CFR §2635.502	Personal and Business Relationships
Title 5 CFR Subpart G § 2635.705(b)	Use of Official Time
EPA Order 3120.1 (11)	Using government property or Government employees in duty status for other than the official purpose

This information is submitted for your consideration and decision as to whether administrative action is warranted. Note that this report and its enclosures were redacted in order to provide confidentiality as requested by [REDACTED] EPA employee. Please have your staff respond to

Assistant Inspector General for Investigations (AIGI) Patrick Sullivan at (202) 566-0308 or [Sullivan.Patrick@epa.gov](mailto:Sullivan.Patrick@epa.gov) with your decision within 30 days of the receipt of this document.

Attachment:

1. Report of Investigation



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS  
1301 CONSTITUTION AVE, NW  
EPA WEST BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

REFERRED FOR ACTION REPORT OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING

SES, REGION (ET AL)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Narrative  
Entities and Individuals  
Prosecutive Status  
Exhibits

Section A  
Section B  
Section C

Distribution:

Regional Administrator  
Region

With Attachments

Bob Perciasepe  
Deputy Administrator  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20460  
Informational Purposes Only-No Attachments

Submitted by:

Special Agent in Charge  
Office of Professional Responsibility

Approved by:

Deputy Assistant Inspector General for  
Investigations  
Office of Investigations

Reviewed by:

Patrick Sullivan  
Assistant Inspector General  
Office of Investigations



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

**CASE NO.:** OI-AR-2012-ADM-0190 **DATE OPENED:** 4/24/2012

**CASE TITLE:** [REDACTED] SES, **CASE AGENT:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] REGION [REDACTED]  
(ET AL)

**CASE CATEGORY:** EMPLOYEE INTEGRITY **OFFICE:** OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS - HEADQUARTERS

**JOINT AGENCIES:** NONE

**JURISDICTION:** [REDACTED]

SECTION A - NARRATIVE

Introduction

On or about April 24, 2012, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), hotline received an anonymous complaint, via email, alleging that [REDACTED] EPA, had a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee (EPA employee<sup>1</sup>), and that because of this sexual relationship, the EPA employee received a large cash award and was promoted over other more qualified candidates. Additionally, a separate allegation that two other EPA officials also had inappropriate relationships with their subordinates was reviewed and found to be without merit<sup>2</sup>. During the course of the investigation, three additional issues were addressed. The OIG investigated the following:

- [REDACTED] and the EPA employee had a close personal relationship that presents the potential appearance of impartiality in [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee.
- [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] EPA computer and EPA email account for matters related to a non-profit organization, the [REDACTED]<sup>3</sup> including communicating with the EPA employee about the [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] had a sexual relationship with the EPA employee and, because of the sexual relationship, [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee cash awards and promotions (Exhibit 1).

Possible violation(s)

Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, 5 C.F.R. Part 2635.502  
Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, 5 C.F.R. Part 2635.705(b)

<sup>1</sup> This EPA employee requested confidentiality, which is why in this Report of Investigation, along with the associated exhibits, his/her name is redacted.

<sup>2</sup> Since these additional allegations were unsupported, and have no relevance to this Report of Investigation, the names of those individuals have been redacted.

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.\[REDACTED\]](http://www.[REDACTED])

EPA's Appendix-Guidance on Corrective Discipline, EPA ORDER 3120.1

**Impact/Dollar Loss**

The non-adherence to EPA policy and regulations could diminish the public trust, the integrity of the office, and program functionality.

**Synopsis**

The initial allegation that [REDACTED] engaged in a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee was unsupported. Therefore, the sub-allegation that [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee cash awards and promotions due to a sexual relationship was not substantiated. However, [REDACTED] had a close personal relationship with the EPA employee, which included the EPA employee's [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which raises the potential appearance of impartiality of [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee. [REDACTED] In addition, [REDACTED] used [REDACTED] EPA computer and email for [REDACTED] matters and on one occasion asked the EPA employee, via email, to review a document for the [REDACTED]

**Details**

**Investigation Disclosed Allegations Supported**

**Allegation 1:**

[REDACTED] and a subordinate EPA employee had a close personal relationship that presents the potential appearance of impartiality in [REDACTED] supervision of the EPA employee.

**Allegation 1 Findings:**

Allegation supported. The investigation disclosed that [REDACTED] had a close personal relationship with a subordinate EPA employee, which [REDACTED] described as such.

**Allegation 1 Investigative Results:**

On March 27, 2013, [REDACTED] was interviewed and asked if [REDACTED] had a personal relationship with the EPA employee aside from his/her volunteer work for [REDACTED] non-profit organization, the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] responded that [REDACTED] did know the EPA employee both closely and personally, and that they did talk about personal things that happened in their respective lives. [REDACTED] stated there is a "perception" in the office and that the EPA employee is a "victim" because they ([REDACTED] and the EPA employee) have a close working relationship. [REDACTED] explained that the EPA employee had gone through some tough times and that [REDACTED] was there to support the EPA employee. [REDACTED] added that it would be easy to misunderstand that they ([REDACTED] and the EPA employee) had a sexual or personal relationship; however, [REDACTED] tried to be nothing other than a mentor. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] had a personal relationship with many of [REDACTED] staff, since they all attended Christmas parties and other group functions together. [REDACTED] denied ever having a sexual relationship with the EPA employee (Exhibit 2).

On March 27, 2013, the EPA employee was interviewed and asked about his/her relationship with [REDACTED] The EPA employee explained that, for a short period of time, the EPA employee and [REDACTED] had



physical, but non-sexual, contact that the EPA employee may have initiated. The EPA employee indicated that he/she considers [REDACTED] a friend and a good person. The EPA employee stated that he/she had "no hostility whatsoever" towards [REDACTED] and that there was no abuse of authority on [REDACTED] part. The EPA employee also stated he/she did not feel threatened by [REDACTED] and that he/she was not trying to protect [REDACTED] (Exhibit 3).

[REDACTED] during [REDACTED] March 27, 2013 interview, was asked if [REDACTED] had a relationship outside of work with the EPA employee. [REDACTED] responded, "Yes, as it relates to [REDACTED] charitable organization." [REDACTED] confirmed the EPA employee [REDACTED] charitable organization. [REDACTED] stated that there could be an appearance issue, but that the EPA employee did not have to volunteer his/her time. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was only "guilty" of one thing, which was having a relationship with an employee who [REDACTED] charitable organization. [REDACTED] explained that it was unacceptable to [REDACTED] to do anything that would even look like an abuse of [REDACTED] power over [REDACTED] employees (Exhibit 2).

The EPA employee was asked if he/she had a personal relationship with [REDACTED]. The EPA employee stated that he/she did have a limited personal relationship and that they both volunteered for an organization called the [REDACTED] (Exhibit 3)

### **Allegation 2:**

[REDACTED] used [REDACTED] EPA computer and EPA email account for matters related to a non-profit organization, the [REDACTED] including communicating with the EPA employee about the [REDACTED]

### **Allegation 2 Findings:**

Allegation supported. A review of [REDACTED] EPA emails identified approximately thirty (30) emails with keywords relating to the [REDACTED] as well as an email from [REDACTED] to the EPA employee which asked him/her to review a [REDACTED] document.

### **Allegation 2 Investigative Results:**

A breakdown of the keywords of [REDACTED] emails from 20[REDACTED]-20[REDACTED], which relate to the [REDACTED] is as follows (Exhibit 4):

Keyword	email account
[REDACTED]	13
	2
	1
	2
	2
	1
	6
	2
	1
	Total: 30



On February 2, 2009, [REDACTED] sent an EPA email to the EPA employee asking: "[EPA employee] can you take a look at this for format? I need to keep it to one page. Thanks." The email attachment was titled [REDACTED]. The attachment was a letter concerning a [REDACTED] (Exhibit 5).

### Investigation Disclosed Allegations Unsupported

#### Allegation 3:

[REDACTED] had a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee and, because of the sexual relationship, [REDACTED] gave the EPA employee cash awards and promotions.

#### Allegation 3 Findings:

Allegation unsupported. This investigation did not reveal evidence to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] engaged in a sexual relationship with a subordinate EPA employee. Therefore, [REDACTED] did not give the EPA employee cash awards and promotions because of a sexual relationship.

#### Allegation 3 Investigative Results:

[REDACTED] denied ever having a sexual relationship with the EPA employee (Exhibit 2). The EPA employee denied having a sexual relationship with [REDACTED] although the EPA employee did state that they engaged in some physical contact (Exhibit 3). [REDACTED] stated that any awards the EPA employee received had nothing to do with a personal relationship between them (Exhibit 2). The EPA employee was asked if he/she and [REDACTED] ever discussed his/her receiving promotions or bonuses. The EPA employee replied they, "Never talked about it." (Exhibit 3)

[REDACTED] was also asked if the EPA employee's volunteer work for the [REDACTED] influenced [REDACTED] authorization of any awards or promotions the EPA employee received. [REDACTED] explained any promotions or awards the EPA employee's received had "nothing" to do with him/her volunteering for the [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] would, "put [the EPA employee's] work against anybody in the organization." [REDACTED] explained that the EPA employee was an outstanding professional and performer, who did the job of two people, including that of a GS-15. [REDACTED] explained the EPA employee started as a GS- [REDACTED] was promoted to a GS- [REDACTED] and then promoted to a GS- [REDACTED]. The EPA employee worked at a very high level and was a natural for upward promotion. [REDACTED] stated that the EPA employee was on a career track for another promotion and would bypass some of his/her peers. [REDACTED] explained that some GS [REDACTED] employees saw that the EPA employee was being promoted quickly, but they were not performing at the same high level as the EPA employee. [REDACTED] stated the EPA employee had potential due to a hard work ethic, and excellent performance (Exhibit 2).

A review of the EPA employee's cash awards from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] showed he/she received yearly cash awards in the average amount of approximately \$2,000.00, with a high of \$ [REDACTED] and low of [REDACTED] (Exhibit 6).

Disposition

This Report of Investigation is being provided to [REDACTED] Regional Administrator, Region [REDACTED] for your review and any administrative remedies or actions you deem appropriate.

**SECTION B – ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS**

**Name:** [REDACTED]  
**Title & Company:** [REDACTED] **Region** [REDACTED] **EPA**  
**Role:** Subject  
**Business Address:** [REDACTED] **Floor,** [REDACTED]  
**EPA Employee:** Yes

-----

**SECTION C – PROSECUTIVE STATUS**

**ADMIN/CRIMINAL/CIVIL ACTION(S):**

This case was investigated as a purely administrative matter. As such, no criminal declination was sought or received from the United States Attorney's Office.



**EXHIBITS**

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>EXHIBIT</u>
Complaint Initiation	1
Memorandum of Interview, [REDACTED] dated March 19, 2013	2
Memorandum of Interview, EPA employee dated March 18, 2013	3
Memorandum of Activity, Forensic Review of [REDACTED] and EPA employee email accounts dated February 11, 2014	4
Email dated February 2, 2009 from [REDACTED] to EPA employee	5
Memorandum of Activity, EPA employee Promotions and Awards	6



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: NOVEMBER 25, 2014

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AT-2014-CAC-0002

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED]

EPA REGION [REDACTED]

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	EPA REGION [REDACTED], [REDACTED]	

**VIOLATION(S):** 18 U.S. Code § 641, Public money, property or records ([REDACTED]) Code, Title [REDACTED] Theft by Taking ([REDACTED] EPA Order 3120.1(10), Stealing, actual or attempted, unauthorized possession of Government property or property of others ([REDACTED] EPA Order 3120.1 (7) Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful ([REDACTED])

EPA Order 3120.1(27) Forging or falsifying official Government records or documents ([REDACTED])

**ALLEGATIONS:** U.S. EPA Region [REDACTED] stole EPA property and subsequently pawned the stolen property. U.S. EPA Region [REDACTED] falsified [REDACTED] 2012 and 2013 property inventories by certifying that [REDACTED] had conducted an inventory of one-hundred percent of the property items assigned to [REDACTED] custodial area.

**FINDINGS:** EPA Region [REDACTED] pawned U.S. EPA property on seven (7) separate occasions. [REDACTED] profited from these pawns by receiving \$490.00 from the pawn loans. [REDACTED] pawned U.S. EPA property on seven (7) separate occasions from July 2012 through September 2012. [REDACTED] redeemed two of the pawned items. However, only one (1) item was returned to the EPA; the other item was subsequently pawned a second time by [REDACTED] and the pawn loan period expired. A total of five (5) of pawn loans expired and the property was never returned to the EPA. [REDACTED] was dishonest with the area property custodian when questioned about [REDACTED] missing assigned camera. [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED], provided an opportunity for employees to provide information about the missing property. [REDACTED] failed to

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

Page 1

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

disclose to [REDACTED] supervisor or property custodian [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) disposition of the pawned property.

On November 18, 2013, EPA-OIG interviewed [REDACTED] was advised of Garrity rights and [REDACTED] signed and initialed that [REDACTED] understood these rights. [REDACTED] was not initially truthful with EPA-OIG when questioned. However, once overwhelming evidence was presented, [REDACTED] admitted to pawning EPA property on seven (7) occasions. [REDACTED] provided EPA-OIG with a sworn statement which acknowledged [REDACTED] pawning of the EPA property.

The loss to the EPA is valued at \$3,117.79, based on the acquisition price of the EPA property items identified that expired on pawn. Purchase records could not be located for two of the EPA property items stolen by [REDACTED] and are not included in the aforementioned loss amount.

This investigation further revealed that EPA Region [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] falsely certified [REDACTED] FY2012 & FY2013 physical property inventories. In FY2012 & FY2013, [REDACTED] signed and certified that [REDACTED] conducted a physical inventory of one-hundred percent of the property items assigned to custodial area [REDACTED]. EPA-OIG's investigation revealed that two of the property items allegedly inventoried by [REDACTED] were previously pawned by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and were not physically present to inventory. Despite these facts, [REDACTED] still certified that one-hundred percent of property items were inventoried, including the two property items that had been previously pawned by [REDACTED].

**DISPOSITION:** Prosecution of [REDACTED] thefts was declined by the U.S. Attorney's Office for [REDACTED], due to (b) (5) [REDACTED]

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] with the offense of Theft by Taking.

On October 13, 2014, [REDACTED] pleaded guilty to Theft by Taking, in violation of [REDACTED] County Superior Court. [REDACTED] was adjudicated guilty and sentenced following [REDACTED] plea under First Offender/Conditional Discharge. [REDACTED] was sentenced to three (3) years of probation, fifty (50) hours of community service, a fine of \$1,000, and ordered to pay restitution to the EPA in the amount of \$3,117.79.

On November 12, 2014, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] sentence was amended to delete the previously ordered community service hours.



On December 24, 2013, SA [REDACTED] referred [REDACTED] thefts to EPA Region [REDACTED]. On January 17, 2014, EPA Region [REDACTED] issued a memorandum which proposed the suspension of [REDACTED] for (b) (5) days. On May, 2, 2014, Deputy Regional Administrator [REDACTED] issued a memorandum detailing the final decision for the proposed disciplinary action against [REDACTED]. Deputy Regional Administrator [REDACTED] final decision was to suspend [REDACTED] for thirty (30) days.

On May 14, 2014, SA [REDACTED] referred [REDACTED] false certifications of [REDACTED] FY2012 and FY2013 physical property inventories to EPA Region [REDACTED]. On June 20, 2014, SA [REDACTED] received a copy of a letter of warning that was issued to [REDACTED] in reference to [REDACTED] false certifications of [REDACTED] property inventories.

Case is recommended for closure.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS**



**REFERRAL REPORT OF INVESTIGATION CONCERNING**



OI-AT-2014-CAC-0002

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Narrative  
Entities and Individuals  
Exhibits

Section A  
Section B

---

Distribution:  
Office of the [REDACTED] County District Attorney

Approvals: [REDACTED]  
Special Agent [REDACTED]

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL  
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

**DATE OPENED:** October 22, 2013

**CASE TITLE:** [REDACTED]

**CASE AGENT:** SA [REDACTED]

**JOINT AGENCIES:** None

**OFFICE:** [REDACTED] Field Office

**JURISDICTION:** This investigation falls under the authority of EPA-OIG because it involves an EPA employee that stole property belonging to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

**SECTION A - NARRATIVE**

**Introduction**

On October 21, 2013, EPA-OIG Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED] initiated a proactive investigation for the purpose of locating stolen EPA Region [REDACTED] property. This proactive investigation utilized the database (b) (7)(E) [REDACTED]. On October 21, 2013, SA [REDACTED] (b) (7)(E) [REDACTED] EPA Canon digital camera identified by EPA Region [REDACTED] property records as being lost, damaged, or destroyed, into the (b) (7)(E) [REDACTED] database. The database produced a result showing that a Canon digital camera (b) (7)(E) [REDACTED] was pawned on July 20, 2012, at Pawn [REDACTED], by [REDACTED] subsequently identified as a [REDACTED] with EPA Region [REDACTED].

**Impact/Dollar Loss**

The loss to the U.S. EPA is valued at \$3,117.79.

**Synopsis**

EPA Region [REDACTED] pawned U.S. EPA property on seven (7) separate occasions. [REDACTED] profited from these pawns by receiving \$490.00 from the pawn loans. [REDACTED] was interviewed and admitted to pawning the EPA owned property identified during the investigation. [REDACTED] admitted to pawning U.S. EPA property on seven (7) separate occasions from July 2012 through September 2012. [REDACTED] redeemed two of the pawned items. However, only one (1) item was returned to the EPA; the other redeemed item was subsequently pawned a second time by [REDACTED] and the pawn loan period expired. A total of five (5) of pawn loans expired and the property was never returned to the EPA. [REDACTED] was dishonest with the area property custodian when questioned about [REDACTED] missing assigned camera. Further, [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED] provided an opportunity for employees to provide information about the missing



property. [REDACTED] failed to disclose to [REDACTED] supervisor or property custodian [REDACTED] disposition of the pawned property. [REDACTED] was not initially truthful with EPA-OIG when questioned about [REDACTED] camera. However, once overwhelming evidence was presented, [REDACTED] admitted to pawning EPA property. The total loss to the EPA is valued at \$3,117.79, based on the acquisition price of the EPA property items that expired on pawn.

### Details

A review of pawn records obtained via an Inspector General subpoena from Pawn [REDACTED] located on [REDACTED] Highway in [REDACTED] revealed the following:

1. On July 16, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Nikon Coolpix 950 digital camera, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$40.00 (Exhibit 1). [REDACTED] admitted during [REDACTED] interview with EPA-OIG that the aforementioned Nikon Coolpix 950 is EPA property (Exhibit 3).

The EPA Region [REDACTED] could not locate property records for this camera. The dollar loss for the Nikon Coolpix 950 is unknown as property records cannot be located for this item (Exhibit 4).

2. On July 20, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Canon Powershot SD780 IS digital camera, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$40.00 (Exhibit 2). On August 15, 2012, [REDACTED] returned to the Pawn [REDACTED] and paid the loan repayment amount of \$50.00. Pawn [REDACTED] returned the Canon Powershot SD780 IS digital camera back to [REDACTED] custody (Exhibit 6).
3. On August 3, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Sony HDRPJ50V camcorder, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$120.00 (Exhibit 2). The loan period for the Sony HDRPJ50V camcorder expired on October 4, 2012. The Sony HDR-PJ50V camcorder was resold by Pawn [REDACTED] on April 16, 2013 (Exhibit 6).

EPA property records confirmed the EPA acquired the Sony HDRPJ50V camcorder serial number [REDACTED], on August 12, 2011, for \$932.90 (Exhibit 5).

4. On August 15, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Sony HDR-SR12 camcorder, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$150.00 (Exhibit 2). The loan period for the HDR-SR12 camcorder expired on October 15, 2012. The Sony HDR-SR12 was resold by Pawn [REDACTED] on March 5, 2013 (Exhibit 6).

EPA property records confirmed the EPA acquired the HDR-SR12 camcorder serial number [REDACTED], on August 26, 2008, for \$1,479.95 (Exhibit 5).

5. On August 17, 2012, [REDACTED] re-pawned the Canon Powershot SD780 digital camera, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$50.00 (Exhibit 2). The loan period on the Canon Powershot SD780 expired on the October 18, 2012; however, the loan was extended on October 30, 2012. [REDACTED] paid \$47.50 toward the loan for the extension. The second loan expired on January 16, 2013. The item was not resold by Pawn [REDACTED] and was considered lost inventory (inventory shrinkage) (Exhibit 6).

EPA property records confirmed that the EPA acquired the Canon Powershot SD780 digital camera serial number [REDACTED], on September 8, 2009, for \$214.95 (Exhibit 5).

6. On August 30, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Canon Powershot S2IS digital camera. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$50.00 (Exhibit 1).

EPA Region [REDACTED] employee [REDACTED] provided EPA-OIG with documents regarding the purchase of a Canon Powershot S2IS by the EPA Region [REDACTED]. The documents show that the EPA purchased a Canon S2IS camera for \$489.99, from tigerdirect.com, using a government purchase card. [REDACTED] noted that [REDACTED] did not possess the serial number for the S2IS that [REDACTED] purchased, so there was no way to definitively match the purchased S2IS to the S2IS pawned by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] further noted that the camera was assigned to an employee who is no longer with the EPA (Exhibit 10).

7. On September 15, 2012, [REDACTED] pawned a Canon Powershot SD850 IS digital camera, serial number [REDACTED]. The pawn loan amount paid to [REDACTED] was \$40.00 (Exhibit 2). The Canon Powershot SD850 IS was redeemed by [REDACTED] on October 30, 2012. [REDACTED] made a payment of \$69.99 to redeem this camera (Exhibit 6). The Canon Powershot 850 IS digital camera, serial number [REDACTED], was [REDACTED] digital camera for use in performance of [REDACTED] job duties (Exhibit 11).

EPA property records confirmed the EPA acquired the Canon Powershot SD850 IS digital camera, serial number [REDACTED], on September 6, 2007, for \$309.98 (Exhibit 5). [REDACTED] admitted during [REDACTED] interview that the Canon Powershot S2IS was EPA property (Exhibit 3).

On [REDACTED] 2013, [REDACTED] supervisor, [REDACTED] sent an email to all Office [REDACTED] employees, including [REDACTED] advising them that a property inventory revealed that a video camera was missing. [REDACTED] email requested that employees help determine the location of the missing property. [REDACTED] told EPA-OIG that [REDACTED] sent the above email because [REDACTED] wanted to provide an opportunity for an employee to return the property if they had taken it. [REDACTED] did not inform [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] disposition of the camcorder (Exhibit 9).

On October 21, 2013, EPA Region [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was interviewed regarding the missing equipment. [REDACTED] told EPA-OIG that [REDACTED] questioned [REDACTED] about the missing camcorder. [REDACTED] did not inform [REDACTED] about [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) disposition of the camcorder (Exhibit 8). The Canon Powershot SD780 IS digital camera, serial number [REDACTED], is EPA property that was assigned to [REDACTED] for performance of [REDACTED] job duties. [REDACTED] questioned [REDACTED] when the Canon Powershot SD780 IS digital camera could not be located during [REDACTED] property inventory. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) had loaned the camera to another EPA employee, but that [REDACTED] could not remember who [REDACTED] loaned the camera to (Exhibit 8).

On November 18, 2013, EPA-OIG Special Agents [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED] regarding the allegation that [REDACTED] pawned property belonging to the U.S. EPA. EPA-OIG advised [REDACTED] of Garrity rights (signed acknowledgement of Garrity rights is Exhibit 2, Attachment 1). [REDACTED] initially stated that [REDACTED] Canon digital camera was taken by an unknown person from a locked property cabinet located in the [REDACTED] office area. After [REDACTED] was presented with overwhelming evidence of the pawning of [REDACTED] digital camera, [REDACTED] stated "I did it." [REDACTED] affirmed that [REDACTED] had pawned [REDACTED] Canon digital camera, as well as several other EPA property items. [REDACTED] admitted to pawning cameras and camcorders belonging to the U.S. EPA on seven (7) separate occasions. [REDACTED] viewed [REDACTED] ( [REDACTED] ) collective history of pawns and stated with the exception of the Olympus C8080 pawned on July 5, 2012, all of the remaining cameras and camcorders were property items belonging to the U.S. EPA. [REDACTED] noted that the aforementioned Olympus camera was [REDACTED] personal camera. [REDACTED] further noted that all of the pawned cameras and camcorders were assigned to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that the taking and pawning of EPA property items were "spontaneous" events that were not planned. [REDACTED] further stated the [REDACTED] was drowning financially. [REDACTED] noted that [REDACTED] had planned to redeem all of the pawned EPA property items, but due [REDACTED] financial situation, [REDACTED] was unable to redeem all of the items. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] did redeem some of the EPA property items. [REDACTED] again stated "I did it", followed by "I'm sorry." [REDACTED] stated "didn't feel I had any other choice or options." (Exhibit 3)

[REDACTED] provided EPA-OIG with a sworn statement (Exhibit 3, Attachment 4). [REDACTED] wrote in [REDACTED] sworn statement that [REDACTED] "did pawn EPA's cameras while under financial duress." [REDACTED] raised [REDACTED] right hand and swore that the written statement [REDACTED] provided was truthful.



## SECTION B – ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

**Name:** [REDACTED]  
**Title & Company:** [REDACTED], U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
**Grade:** GS [REDACTED]  
**Role:** Subject  
**Home Address:** [REDACTED]  
**Work Address:** [REDACTED] Floor, [REDACTED]

## EXHIBITS

DESCRIPTION	EXHIBIT
MOA – Review of (b) (7)(E) Results	1
MOA – Review of Original Pawn Tickets	2
MOI – Interview of [REDACTED]	3
MOA – Review of [REDACTED] Response, Canon S2IS and Nikon Coolpix 950	4
MOA – Review of EPA Property Records	5
MOA – Review of Pawn History and Disposition Records	6
MOA – Review of Report of Survey FY13-15	7
MOI – Interview of [REDACTED]	8
MOI – Interview of [REDACTED]	9
MOA – Review Canon S2IS Purchase Records	10
MOA – [REDACTED] Property Emails	11



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: JULY 14, 2014

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AT-2014-CAC-0092

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECT: THREAT LETTER ADDRESSED TO R4  
ADMINISTRATOR

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
UNKNOWN SUBJECT	ASHEVILLE, NC	

**VIOLATION(S):** 18 U.S. Code § 876 - Mailing threatening communications

**ALLEGATION:** An unknown subject sent a letter to the EPA Region IV Administrator which stated "go to hell Monsanto and the Federal government, we're taking you out."

**FINDINGS:** Through investigation it was determined that the handwritten, anonymous, and undated threat letter was written during an environmental activist event held by the group First Saturday at the Altamont brewery in Asheville, NC, on May 3, 2014. Investigative interviews revealed that First Saturday membership is somewhere between seven (7) and twenty (20) members. First Saturday meets on the first Saturday of each month to discuss clean water issues. [REDACTED], described First Saturday as a group whose goal is to motivate people to use their voice for environmental concerns.

Investigative interviews revealed that the event at the Altamont brewery benefited the Western North Carolina (WNC) Alliance. First Saturday member [REDACTED] advised that the WNC Alliance was the first to sue Duke Energy after Duke Energy's coal ash spill. [REDACTED] further advised that the event was also a means to advocate for clean water issues and to address issues involving coal ash. Based on interviews, an estimated that fifty (50) to one-hundred (100) people attended the event at the Altamont brewery and the event lasted several hours in length. An interview with an attendee [REDACTED] indicated that [REDACTED] did not attend the event because of the group hosting the event, but instead because [REDACTED].

First Saturday had a booth at the event that provided raffle tickets to individuals who wrote a letter to the EPA. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] did not hear anyone at the event discussing Monsanto or making any threats against the Federal government

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

This report is the property of the Office of Investigations and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. 552.

while working the booth. [REDACTED] noted that the letters to the EPA were intended to address clean water issues. First Saturday mailed the letter for the participants. [REDACTED] indicated that First Saturday did not review the letters before mailing them, but that [REDACTED] felt that it was something that the group should now do. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] was surprised that the threat letter referenced Monsanto since the event did not address Monsanto or GMO's (genetically modified organisms). [REDACTED] reiterated that the event was intended to address clean water issues. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] did not know who wrote the threat letter.

EPA-OIG also interviewed [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] did not know who wrote the threat letter to the EPA. [REDACTED] further advised that [REDACTED] did not hear anyone at the event discussing their dislike of Monsanto or the Federal government.

**DISPOSITION:** Interviews with three of the event attendees, including two of the members of the group First Saturday which held the event at the Altamont brewery, provided no further leads to trace the anonymous threat letter. Case is recommended closure. Case may be reopened upon presentation of new leads.